

## THE POWER OF PRAYER;

OR, THE FIRST STEAMBOAT UP THE ALABAMA.

By Sidney and Clifford Lanier.

You, Dinah! Come and set me whar de ribber-roads does meet.  
De Lord, He made dese black-jack roots to twis' into a seat.  
Umph, dar! De Lord have mussy on dis blin' ole nigger's feet.

It 'pear to me dis mornin' I kin smell de fust o' June.  
I 'clar, I b'lieve dat mockin'-bird could play de fiddle soon!  
Dem yonder town-bells sounds like dey was ringin' in de moon.

Well, ef dis nigger 's been blind fer fo'ty year or mo',  
Dese ears, dey sees de world, like, th'u' de cracks dat's in de do'.  
For de Lord has built dis body wid de windows 'hind and 'fo'.

I know my front ones is stopped up, and things is sort o' dim,  
But den, th'u' dem, temptation's rain won't leak in on ole Jim!  
De back ones shows me earth enough, aldo' dey's mon's'ous slim.

And es fer Hebben,—bless de Lord, and praise His holy name—  
Dat shines in all de co'ners of dis cabin jes' de same  
As ef dat cabin hadn't nar' a plank upon de frame!

Who call me? Listen down de ribber, Dinah! Don't you hyar  
Somebody hollin' "Hoo, Jim, hoo"? My Sarah died las' y'ar;  
Is dat black angel done come back to call ole Jim 'fom hyar?

My stars, dat can't be Sarah, shuh! Jes' listen, Dinah, now!  
What kin be comin' up dat bend, a-makin' sich a row?  
Fus' bellerin' like a pawin' bull, den squealin' like a sow?

De Lord 'a' massy sakes alive, jes' hear,—ker-woof, ker-woof—  
De Debbie's comin' round dat bend, he's comin', shuh enuff,  
A-splashin' up de water wid his tail and wid his hoof!

I'se pow'ful skeered; but neversomeless I ain't gwine run away;  
I'm gwine to stand stiff-legged fer de Lord dis blessed day.  
You screech, and hawl, and swish de water, Satan! Let us pray.

O hebbin' Mah'ar, what thou wilt, dat mus' be jes' so,  
And et Thou hast bespoke de word, some nigger's bond to go.  
Den, Lord, please take ole Jim, and let young Dinah hyar below!

Scuse Dinah, scuse her Mah'ar; for she's sich a little chile,  
She hardly jes' begin to scramble up de home-yard stile  
But dis ole traveler's feet been tired dis many a many a mile.

I'se wufless as de rotten pole of las' year's folder-stick,  
De rheumatiz done bit my bones; you hear 'em crack and crack?  
I can't sit down 'dout gruntin' like 'twas breakin' o' my back.

What use de wheel, when hub and spokes is warped and split, and rotten?  
What use dis dried-up cotton-stalk, when Life done picked my cotton?  
I've like a word dat somebody done said, and den forgotten.

But, Dinah! Shuh dat gal jes' like dis little hick'ry-tree,  
De sap 's jes' risin' in her; she do grow owda-clooselee—  
Lord, ef you 'clarin' de underbrush, don't cut her down, cut me!

I would not proud perfume—but yet I'll boldly make request;  
Sence Jacob had dat wrastlin'-match, I, too, gwine do my bes';  
When Jacob got all underholt, de Lord He answered Yes!

And what for waste de vittles, now, and th'ow away de bread,  
Jes' for to strength dese idle hands to scratch dis old bald head?  
T'ink of de 'conomy, Mah'ar, ef dis ole Jim was dead!

Stop; ef I do believe de Debbie's gone on up de stream!  
Jes' now he squealed down dar;—hush; dat's a mighty weakly screem!  
Yas, sir, he's gone, he's gone;—he snort way off, like in a dream!

O glory hallelujah to de Lord dat reigns on high!  
De Debbie's fall'y skeered to def, he done gone flyin' by;  
I know'd he could'n stand dat pra'r, I felt my Mah'ar nigh!

You, Dinah; ain't you 'shamed, now, dat you did'n't trust to grace?  
I heerd you thrashin' th'u' de bushes when he showed his face!  
You fool, you think de Debbie couldn't beat you in a race?

I tell you, Dinah, jes' as sure as you is standin' dar,  
When folks starts prayin', answer-angels drops down th'u' de a'r.  
Yea, Dinah, whar 'ould you be now, exceptin' fur dat pra'r?

— Scribner for June.

## MARK TWAIN ON SPELLING.

The Beauty of Unfettered Originality in Orthography.

There was a spelling match at the Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn., on Wednesday evening, and Mr. Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain) being called on for a few preliminary remarks spoke as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen; I have been honored with the office of introducing these approaching orthographical solemnities with a few remarks. The temperance crusade swept the land some time ago, that is, that vast portion of the land where it was needed, but it skipped Hartford. Now comes this new spelling epidemic, and this time we are stricken. So, I suppose we needed the affliction. I don't say we needed it, for I don't see any use in spelling a word right, and never did. I mean I don't see any use in having a uniform and arbitrary way of spelling words. We might as well make all clothes alike and cook all dishes alike. Sameness is tiresome; variety is pleasing. I have a correspondent whose letters are always a refreshment to me, there is such a breezy unlettered originality about his orthography. He always spells Kow with a large K. Now that is just as good as to spell it with a small one. It is better. It gives the imagination a broader field, a wide scope. It suggests to the mind a grand, vague, impressive kind of a cow. Superb effects can be produced by variegated spelling. Now there is Blind Tom, the musical prodigy. He always spells a word according to the sound that is carried to his ear. And he is an enthusiast in orthography. When you give him a word, he shouts it out—puts his soul into it. I once heard him called upon to spell orang-outang before an audience. He said, "O, r-a-n-g, orang, ger, ger, oranger, t-a-n-g, tang, oranger tang!" Now, a body can respect a orang-outang that spells his name in a vigorous way. But that dictionary makes a mere kitten of him. In the old times people spelled just as they pleased. That was the right idea. You had two chances at a stranger then. You knew a strong man from a weak one by his iron-clad spelling and his hand-writing helped you to verify your verdict. Some people have an idea that correct spelling can be taught—and taught to anybody. This is a mistake: The spelling faculty is born in a man, like poetry, music and art. It is a gift; it is a talent. People who have this gift in a high degree only need a word once in print, and its is forever photographed upon their memory. They can not forget it. People who haven't it must be content to spell more or less—like thunder—and expect to splinter the dictionary wherever their orthographical lightning happens to strike. There are 114,000 words in the unabridged dictionary. I know a lady who can spell only 180 of them right. She steers clear of all the rest. She can't learn any more. So her letters always consist of those constantly recurring 180 words. Now and then, when she finds herself obliged to write upon a subject which necessitates the use of some other words, she—well, she don't write on that subject. I have a relative in New York who is almost sublimely gifted. She can't spell any word right. There is a game called Verbarium. A dozen people are each provided with a sheet of paper across the top of which is written a long word like kaleidoscopical, or something like that, and the game is to see who can make up the most words out of that in three minutes, always beginning with the initial letter of that word. Upon one occasion the word chosen was cofferdam. When time was called, everybody had built from five to twenty words, except this young lady. She only had one—calf. We all studied a moment, and then said, "Why, there is no 'l' in cofferdam." Then we examined her paper. To the eternal honor of that uninspired, unconscious, sublimely-independent soul be it said, she had spelt that word "calf!" If anybody here can spell calf any more sensibly than that, let him step to the front and take his milk. The insurrection will now begin.

**A MAN DIES FROM SHEER FRIGHT.**—Five weeks ago Alexander V. Brower, of Schenectady, lacerated a finger by means of a corn-cutter. He was attended by a leading physician, and in due course of time the wound healed, leaving a mark for a while of a pinkish indigo tint. While attending church subsequently, at the East avenue mission chapel, a fellow-pew occupant asked to see his hand. Observing the partly healed wound, he whispered to Brower that in his opinion the wound had mortified. Brower's rather sat in the pew with him. His son took a piece of paper and wrote thereon, and handed to his father a request that they leave church. The father, on reaching the outside, asked the cause of the sudden request. The answer was that he (the son) was going to die. Mr. Brower ridiculed the idea, but proceeded home. After a time following their arrival, the father found his son engaged in prayer, and was again told by the latter that his end was near. The son had to be soon removed to a bed, and the doctor was again summoned. The latter, on arrival, found his patient with high pulse, and excited and showing marked symptoms of typhoid fever. The former wound on his hand was found in the same condition as when last seen—that is, everything presaging rapid and permanent healing. Friday, young Brower died—an evident victim of fright.

By forgiveness of injuries, the learned are purified; by liberality, those who have neglected their duty; by pious meditation, those who have secret faults; by devout austerity, those who least know the Veda. —Manu.

## SPEECH

GEO. H. SHIELDS,

OF ST. LOUIS.

In the Convention, May 20th, 1875.

The question being on striking out of the present Constitution the provisions acknowledging the limitations of the Constitution of the United States on the political power of the State, and declaring that this State shall ever remain a member of the American Union, Mr. Shields said:

MR. CHAIRMAN:—I have listened with a considerable degree of interest to the debate upon this subject, because of the diverse opinions that have been expressed, and because I desired to know what the feeling of this Convention was on the propositions that were submitted in the amendment offered by the member from St. Charles, (Mr. Lackland). I think, sir, that the Convention loses sight of one branch of that amendment, and has lost sight of it in all the discussion that has taken place. I should not have inaugurated this discussion, for the reason that I knew that on the proposition as submitted there was a diversity of opinion, and it might be considered that, if I, or any member of the political party to which I belong, inaugurated it, it would be only for the purpose of engendering political dissension and controversial strife. I have, consequently, refrained so far from debating the question. It strikes me that we are wandering and have wandered wholly from that point of the subject. I do not intend now to make any very lengthy remarks, but simply to call the attention of the Convention to what I consider the three great principles involved in this amendment.

If I read it correctly, it is "that the people of this State have the inherent, sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government, and police thereof, and of altering and abolishing their Constitution and form of government, wherever it may be necessary to their safety; that every such right should be exercised in pursuance of law, and consistently with the Constitution of the United States." That is identically the fifth section of the present Constitution, and it has been argued on this floor that it was not proper that the inherent, sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police power of the State, should be made subject to any limitation whatever, except the will of the people.

If I understood that that section of the constitution had such scope I might agree with the gentleman from Lafayette (Mr. Wallace) who announced the idea. My construction of the section, however, is this. The words "every such right should be exercised in pursuance of law consistently with the constitution of the United States," refer and are particularly applicable to the clause of the section, which says "of altering and abolishing their constitution and form of government," in other words that the provision of law, as it exists, lays down the broad and fundamental principle that, as far as our internal government is concerned, the state has the sole, inherent and exclusive right of action, but that as far as our power to abolish our form of government and our constitution is concerned, we are hemmed in and restricted by the provisions of the Federal Constitution and can not go beyond those limitations or restrictions.

That will be the construction I shall give to the section, and therefore I do not think that the very able argument that has been made by the gentleman from Lafayette (Mr. Wallace) has application, if my construction is correct, because the limitation referred to in the latter part of the section which says "every such right shall be exercised in pursuance of law and consistently with the constitution of the United States," is a limitation on the charge of form of government, and not on the regulations of internal affairs. Then there is another proposition which is embodied in the amendment of the gentleman from St. Charles, Mr. Lackland. "That this State shall ever remain a member of the American Union; that every citizen of the State owes paramount allegiance to the constitution of the United States, and that no law or ordinance of the State, in contravention or subversion thereof, can have any binding force."

Argument on this question, Mr. Chairman, has been left almost entirely out of this discussion, and the main argument against it, is that that is a "settled question," and that it is also settled that the limitations on altering and abolishing our constitution, laid upon us by the Federal constitution, are unnecessary to be declared, because they exist, and so existing and being compulsory upon us it is useless for us to enunciate them in our constitution. That may be a correct technical proposition, but I ask every member of this convention whether the same argument advanced on that proposition would not kill the other provision in the bill of rights. "That the political power is vested in and derived from the people." We have adopted that; we have already passed on that proposition; that is a self-evident proposition; that is a settled question. Then why was it that this convention, in committee of the whole, debated and adopted that proposition, when it was a "settled question" and beyond any control of ours?

When we come to the next propositions, "that the people have the right to peaceably assemble for the common good; that men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; and that they are settled questions. Why put these then in the Bill of Rights, if the argument made against declaring affirmatively the limitations of the constitution, and this provision, as to our being a member of the Union, are to be held valid. These general principles were settled in the constitution of the United States, Declaration of Independence, and the

struggle of the Revolutionary war, and the struggle for constitutional liberty in England, and we acknowledge them. Yet we think it is necessary to put them in the constitution, and proper to do so. Therefore, I contend that the argument, that it is not necessary to mention the limitations of the constitution of the United States, because they are understood and acknowledged by all, proves entirely too much. It militates against these other propositions fully in the same manner, and they should also be left out of the Bill of Rights. I am in favor of the views expressed by the gentleman from Marion, and of other gentlemen who have spoken on this view of the question, (particularly the gentlemen from Jackson,) who are in favor of putting into the Bill of Rights "that the alteration of our form of government and our constitution must be done subject to the provisions of the National constitution."

There is another question, however, to which I desire to refer, not for the purpose of parading my particular views before this convention, but for the purpose of calling the attention of the convention to its candid and serious consideration before we vote on the resolution of the gentleman from Sullivan to strike out all after the words he has mentioned in his amendment; and that is the declaration "that we shall remain forever a member of the American union, that every State owes paramount allegiance to the constitution of the United States, and that no law or ordinance of this State in contravention or subversion thereof can have any binding force." Why you all say, in a moment, "that question is settled—we all agree that it is settled." I apprehend there is not a gentleman in the State of Missouri, or in the United States, who does not admit—no matter how he may feel on the subject—that as far as the power of arms and the power of circumstances can settle human questions that come before the people for adjudication, it is settled, that every State of the American union is a member of it, and that no ordinance, or any law in contravention or subversion of their allegiance to the government would have any binding force.

There is no provision in the Constitution of the United States that absolutely forbids the severing of those bonds that have been spoken of, between the State and the Union, and the fact that we put into the Bill of Rights; that we enact this Constitution "subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States" does not carry with it the idea that you enact an instrument subject to that great fundamental principle that is higher than the Constitution, which has been decided by force of arms, and which everybody admits to be a principle of our government at present. All have acknowledged it; even the President of the Confederacy, in recent remarks in the South, stated that the Union flag—the flag of the Nation—was as much the flag of the seceded States, of those who fought for their principles and opinions, under the banner of the Confederacy, as of any who fought under the old flag. The whole country acknowledges the proposition. Everybody agrees that that is a fundamental proposition in our government, not written in the Constitution, but higher and above any Constitution or any expression in the Federal enactment.

Now, the gentleman from St. Charles, simply asks every member of this Convention to acknowledge and declare that principle. Does the putting of that "section in this Bill of Rights carry with it any intimidation" as suggested by the gentleman from Ray, (Mr. Farris), or other gentlemen who have spoken here? Is there any "demagoguism" in asking the American people to acknowledge that they are members of the American Union? Is there any political question in it, anything that can be used to advantage, for or against any party in the United States, or in the State of Missouri; to say that the American people, Democrats, Republicans, whatever party they may belong to, are American people, and that they all join hands in the effort to perpetuate free government, and the prosperity of their beloved country?

Therefore, I contend, that it is but the acknowledgement of a principle which is as wide as air, in its application, as the principle that we have all subscribed to, "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people." We acknowledge that as a principle of our Republican government; and the other principle is just as much a part of it; and there can be no "intimidation;" it is no disgrace, it is no dishonor, for an American citizen to remember the fact that he belongs to the American Union, and to boldly declare in this Constitution his assertion of the fact, not only for himself, but for posterity.

I do not contend, gentlemen of the convention, that putting this provision in the constitution would make the principle any more secure. I do not pretend if we left it out that it would give us any more right to sever those bands than we have now. I do not pretend that the insertion would give any more valid or binding force to the constitution of the United States or the government, or constitution of Missouri, than they have now. Nor do I contend that if you leave out these broad provisions, the constitution of the United States or the State of Missouri, would not have the same valid force. This principle is acknowledged by all Republican governments and all the States of our Union, I ask whether it is not the part of wisdom to put in the constitution that which we all acknowledge and agree to; that principle which the people of this State have been taught to regard as a part of their constitution for the last ten years, and that principle which the young and rising generation of this state ought to have brought continually before their minds. Do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I have a fear that there will be any more war in this country. I do not believe there will be any desire for war. I do not believe there is a reasonable man within the sound of my voice, and probably in the State of Missouri, who, if he had the power to carry the State out of the Union and inaugurate war, would do it. That question has been irrevocably settled; but when we go before the people, let us be prepared to say to them "this is one of the fundamental and primary principles of our Republican government that has been evolved from a bloody war, and we desire to renounce the fact to you,

that it is settled now, henceforth and as long as this nation may exist.

This branch of the subject has been, as I stated before, in a measure omitted in the discussion.

Now I do not make any remarks for the purpose of thrusting my particular views upon this convention, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not the people of this State will adopt a constitution that leaves out a proposition of that sort when it is brought clearly before the convention. We already have it in the present constitution, and if the convention say we will strike it out, although we understand each other here, although we understand the reasons why we do it, that we do not consider it necessary to put it in, will the people of the State of Missouri understand it in that light?

I believe that the people of this State demand that that provision should be contained in the constitution; and I believe that no man will be "intimidated" as to how to "suppliment" at the throne of the Federal Government; that there will be no danger of a "centralization of power," or that it will be a "question of which 'demagogues will take advantage of hereafter.' It is the assertion of a stubborn truth, which has been settled by force of arms, and which we are all glad has been settled, because it places the American Government on a firmer foundation than ever before, and renders the perpetuity of our institutions beyond any question.

Gentlemen of the committee, I thank you for your attention and in conclusion I desire to state that I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from St. Charles.

PETE MCCARTNEY.

The Redoubtable Counterfeiter Escapes Again—Another Case of Drowsy Guards—Pete McCartney Makes His Exit from a Moving Train.

HOUSTON, TEX., May 20.—The notorious counterfeiter, Pete McCartney, who caused a sensation in April, by his escape and recaptures in Northern Texas, had his cases continued at the recent term of the United States Court at Tyler. The Trial day was fixed for July at Austin, and yesterday Marshal Purnell started with Pete from Tyler, en route to Austin. Pete was heavily shackled and placed in charge of four guards upon the train. At Palestine he was hailed by some parties who said, "Hellow, Pete they have got you at last!" "Yes," said Pete; "but, damn em, they can't hold on to me long." He appeared perfectly easy, and betrayed neither desire nor expectation of making an escape; but while the train was approaching Phelps Station, at about 11 o'clock at night, his guards were found to be sound asleep. McCartney was making for the door of the car, a free man, when one of them aroused and said: "George by God, McCartney's gone!" They made for him, but he gained the platform, and, backing himself, held the door tight closed upon them. On the inside they jerked the bell-cord, but it had been cut, and pulled out of its rings. They then ran to the baggage car to signal the engineer to stop the train. Just then the train reached the head of a grade and it started down. There is a heavy forest of timber at this place, where he flew the train. The Deputy Marshal got off at Phelps, and started back in pursuit of the slippery fugitive. The shackles of McCartney consisted of ankle-bracelets and handcuffs, joined by an iron rod at his seat. After the escape they were found—the handcuffs, iron rod and part of the chain which connected the anklets. The band he carried away upon his legs. The work was done with a very fine file and was a neat job. A party who got upon the cars at Palestine sat and talked with McCartney until just before the escape, when he, too, went to sleep. It is asserted and believed that friends of Pete were on the train assisting and money was used to aid the escape.

HOW HE WON HER.

Jesse James Disguises Himself as a Sewing Machine Agent, and Woos and Wins His Bride.

[Leavenworth Times.]

Among all the adventures chronicled of the James boys, none are more interesting than a description of the manner in which Jesse, the oldest of the boys, wooed and won his bride. During one of the rambles of the latter through Kansas City he spied a damsel whose comeliness of person and grace of action struck his fancy, and in the depths of his brigand heart he felt that he loved her, and that life, to him, would be solitude without the cheering influences of her society. Accordingly, he dressed himself in the disguise of a sewing machine agent and called at the residence of his innamorata. There was a machine at the house to fix, and after doing all the repairing necessary, he managed to get a few moments' conversation with the fair one. The family of the young lady was acquainted with the family of the James', and as the lover went out of the gate, the mother remarked, "How much he looks like one of the James boys." This little discovery did not in the least affect the standing of Jesse in that household, and, although the parentage and history of the former was known to both parents of the girl at last, it did not interfere with the love-making, and in due time, the fall of 1874, the lovers were united in the happy and indissoluble bonds of matrimony. The wife is, even now, a resident of Kansas City, and her husband, whenever the detectives are not on the watch, pays her a visit.

He that trusts against his own reason, speaks against his own conscience, and therefore it is certain that no man serves God with a good conscience who serves him against his reason.—Jeremy Taylor.

Let the counsel of thine own heart stand: for there is no man more faithful unto thee than it. For a man's mind is sometimes wont to tell him more than seven watchmen that sit above in a high tower.—Ecclesiasticus.